

the Johnson Bill the right of way. The hope of the enemies lies in delaying it so that it cannot reach final passage in the Senate until the last days of the session.

Then in the confusion, they hope to attach two or three harmless-looking amendments which will rob it of its teeth. The Johnson Bill is now in committee in the Senate, having passed the House.

The amendment for which the Jews hope most strongly is one excepting from the operation of the new law "any persons fleeing from religious persecution."

There is a clause to that effect in the present literacy law, but because of the fact that the literacy test itself was rendered harmless by the phrasing, the Jews have taken practically no advantage of the religious persecution exemption. Thus public attention has not been directed toward it.

From the Jewish standpoint, the insertion of a similar clause in the Johnson Bill would make the bill ideal. The law then would be, in effect, a prohibition against the admission into the United States of any persons except Jews and Armenians. The Armenian question has not been touched in these articles because Armenia like Russia is at present isolated and Armenian immigration at present is insignificant. Industrially the Armenians have been as unpopular with their neighbors as have the Jews in the lands in which they live. The reasons for the dislike of the two races are somewhat similar. Armenians in Turkey have been the money-lenders and the merchants and their exactions have brought prompt reprisals from the Turks. The cause of the Armenians has been pleaded in Christian countries for centuries and sympathy for them has been general.

The cause of the Turk, however, has always wanted an advocate. The Turks being Mohammedans, without propaganda or friends, have gone on under the odium of "the unspeakable Turk." The Christian world has accepted without question the Armenian side of the problem. Whether there is a Turkish side has been a question left unasked. Immigration officials at Ellis Island who have come in contact with the Armenians say, however, that they furnish a serious racial problem.

The Johnson Bill offered in the House is not the only restrictive measure presented. Senate feeling is said to favor permitting large numbers to enter the country but desires that the United States establish investigating bureaus in other countries and look into the character of individuals before granting passports.

Persons interested in the problem say that strong arguments may be made for each measure, but that neither gets at the crux of the matter.

The Johnson Bill, if enforced, would unquestionably keep out undesirables.

"But," is the inquiry, "is it wise to keep out the able-bodied, energetic, strong-minded Anglo-Saxons, Celts, Germans, Scandinavians and French who may desire to settle in this country?"

At present all the immigration officials say that it is preferable to lose the productive forces of desirable races rather than to take chances with the vast number of undesirables who predominate among present immigrants. A few years hence, should the volume of Jewish immigration lessen, the bars may be raised, say the Johnson Bill advocates.

Supporters of the Sterling Bill say that in theory it is a good one, but practically it would be worthless.

An army of agents throughout Europe would be required. For the bill to be effective, it would be necessary that every agent be absolutely honest, without political ties, above racial considerations, and utterly deaf to sympathetic appeal. Such a force of investigators, it would be manifestly impossible to obtain.

The ideal bill, say all those who have looked into the problem, would be one which excludes as undesirable any race which was deemed impossible of assimilation by America. Such a law, however, would run up against the constitutional rock forbidding class legislation.

One of the veteran immigration officials at Ellis Island points out that while the need is greatest for racial exclusion, there is another change which must come before any plan of restriction may be effectuated. It is rigid enforcement.

"Even the mild restrictions of the present law are not enforced," he said. "We are authorized to exclude persons for medical reasons, because of defective intellects, for pauperism and because they are known criminals. But our exclusion orders may be appealed to Washington. There, one man is called on to decide the question. There isn't one case in a hundred with which we deal that does not have a sympathetic aspect. Aged mothers and fathers, little children, the sick, desperate conditions in general, can be counted on to touch the heart of the assistant secretary who hears the appeal. He acts on each case, and it is natural that he feels that one person more or less will make little difference among 100,000,000. So he generally grants the appeal and the undesirable is entered."

"If a permanent court could be established to pass on appeals, the possibility of one man's honesty, political ties, or sympathetic impulses being reached, would be lessened."

"Such a court should have a tenure of office which would make it subject to no political pressure. Its members should rotate in station so that a person interested in an appeal case would not know whom to approach with pressure or influence."

Immigration officials at Ellis Island are pessimistic over the surface prospects of enactments restricting immigration.

"It's gone too long," they say. "The races interested have too much influence at Washington. Pressure will be brought to bear on newspapers which are subject to influence from heavy Jewish mercantile advertisers, such pressure as was brought to bear at the

## Two Members of Congress Protest Legislation Restricting Immigration of a Type Termed Undesirable, Unassimilable and Un-American

Excerpts from the minority report on the immigration legislation, signed by Representatives Isaac Siegel, of New York, and Adolph J. Sabath, of Illinois:

There is no occasion for the extraordinary haste manifested in the attempt now made to enact this prohibitory measure without giving to it the consideration and deliberation that its importance demands. Nothing can be more unfortunate than legislation inspired by hysteria.

The majority report is especially unfortunate in its references to the number of Jewish immigrants arriving in this country. Classification according to the religion or race of immigrants is without justification. It is opposed to that Americanism that prevailed in the past. The data contained in Appendix A attached to the report are at the most ex parte statements very likely based upon information furnished by prejudiced and unfriendly local authorities.

The allusions to the Jews contained in the majority report are offensive, although we cannot believe that they are intentionally so.

We would not refer to these allusions were it not for the fact that they have a tendency to create in this country an atmosphere of prejudice against all immigrants and because of the further fact that there has recently been conducted a secret and malicious propaganda designed to arouse prejudice against the Jews in various parts of the United States.

We are opposed to this bill because it is based on unsound premises, because it is unnecessary, and because it will inevitably prove injurious to the public welfare. The creation of such a precedent as it affords will tend to legislation productive of isolation and to the retardation of our national growth.

time of the propaganda for Leo Frank, who was convicted of murder in the South. The only hope lies in the possibility that the most influential Jews will fear to combat public opinion at this time and may stay the immigration tide themselves."

Supporters of immigration restriction fear another source of powerful opposition in the steamship companies. These interests have advertised widely throughout Europe. Steerage passage costs as much today as first cabin passage did a dozen years ago. Many of the steamship companies say that the fact that they can crowd so many persons below decks is the only thing that enables them to make money. The profitability of the steerage passenger business is shown by the fact that one of the large steamship companies seriously considered taking over the Leviathan, formerly the Vaterland, and refitting her solely for third class passengers.

The short session of Congress promises to be a lively one on the immigration question.

Lobbying influences from among the Jews and steamship companies are expected to be present in the committee rooms and conferences of the Congressmen.

Whether these influences behind the scenes will be sufficient to overcome by delay, amendment, "joker," or other means, strong legislation to curb undesirable immigration which public sentiment, unfortunately represented by no lobby, so clearly demands, will be an interesting development.

Important, indeed, is the question of delay, for every day's delay in the passage of a bill means the entrance of at least 3,000 more immigrants, the majority of whom are viewed by immigration officials as totally undesirable. The Johnson Bill itself gives 60 days of leeway after signing in which immigration may continue unchecked. This period assures the entry of 200,000 immigrants after Congress has declared against any further immigration.



(C) Harris & Ewing

SENATOR THOMAS STERLING, of South Dakota

As a member of the Senate Committee on Immigration, he journeyed up the bay to Ellis Island in the steerage of a liner. In company with Commissioner of Immigration Frederick A. Wallis, he obtained first-hand information, which afforded the basis for a statement that a change would be made in existing laws governing immigration.

## Bald Heads and Headgear

By JOHN BURROUGHS

WHY is it that we see so many bald-headed men and so few bald-headed women? The hair of women usually becomes thinner and shorter with age, but I do not recall ever having seen one absolutely bald. The reasons are many and complex.

In the first place, women cultivate their hair; they are proud of it; the men admire it; they often use hair tonics; they rarely cut it off or discourage it; they spend much time over it. How pretty the long braids hanging down the backs of school girls, or school girls with their hair flowing free! In terms of biology, hair is a secondary sexual characteristic. It is a device to capture the male, like bare arms and bare shoulders. Blond or brunette hair, if copious enough, is equally attractive to men. In short, we have Biblical authority to the effect that if woman has long hair it is a glory to her, and what poet is it who declares that "Beauty draws us by a single hair"?

Absolutely bald hair in man or woman is very rare except in certain races, for example, the North American Indians, the Japanese, and other Orientals, though I once saw an Irish-American with hair as black as a Japanese.

Woman makes much of her headgear, man very little. Ribbons and flowers and plumes adorn her head. The monster hats women wore a few years ago have about gone out, but the little affairs they wear are often "fearfully and wonderfully made." An old or shabby hat disturbs a woman much more than a man would be disturbed by one. She often brings home the body of her hat and puts on the trimming; the trimming is the all-important thing. The man wears his hat as

it comes from the hatter, its only trimming being the hatband.

The hatless indoor life of women evidently favors the growth and preservation of their hair. Yet men uncover their heads under conditions wherein women do not. We doff our hats as a sign of respect or reverence. Though we may not take off our shoes on holy ground, we do carry our hats in our hands, while under the same conditions women carry theirs on their heads. For the same reason, perhaps, women's heads remain covered in churches, and all the sisters of Charity, and all so-called holy orders, are required to conceal carefully their hair. Rarely does a man sit down to lunch, even in a public restaurant, with his hat on, though women always do. Is it because our hats are so much more easily removed? We have no strings to untie nor hat pins to extract.

The baldness of men is probably largely due to their headgear. The scalp is so protected that nature ceases to provide a covering of her own. The silk or "stovepipe" hat formerly so generally worn, has much to answer for. When I was a young man it was the vogue everywhere on all occasions. In England, I remember seeing the boys at Rugby School playing ball with their "stovepipe" hats on. I myself wore one whenever I "dressed up." One's new hat came in a

bandbox specially shaped for it, in which it was always kept when not in use, and, one must confess, men were then about as particular to have their hats conform to the fashion as women proverbially are about theirs. But the "stovepipe" hat, like the swallow-tailed coat, has had its day, except on formal occasions. It was later followed by the derby hat which was ubiquitous until a few years ago. I have noticed but one on a man's head in several years. The derby was as void of character as an iron pot, yet I remember Mr. Howells wore it for a time. Can one fancy Mark Twain in a derby hat? Walt Whitman always wore a broad brimmed gray, soft felt hat. One thinks of Lincoln with a stovepipe hat on, as he wore this in most of his pictures. Roosevelt liked a wide brimmed felt hat, like that of the cowboys. While he was President I once saw him going to church with a shining silk hat on his head. The first time I saw Emerson he had on a stovepipe hat, one much the worse for wear. He probably never wore any other kind. The broad brimmed, light colored Quaker hat which I used to see often in my boyhood was an improvement on the silk hat. The Cromwell hat had a character of its own, as did the three-cornered Continental hats. When a boy I remember the large black Kossuth hats much in vogue after Kossuth's visit to this country. But all such headgear is undoubtedly unfavorable to the hair crop. The use of cloth caps and soft felt hats is now almost universal among men.

When we all go bareheaded, bald heads will be fewer than they are now.